DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 497 CG 006 630

AUTHOR Beier, Ernst G.; Sternberg, Daniel P.
TITLE Subtle Interactive Cues in Newlyweds.
INSTITUTION Utah Univ., Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE [70]
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; Environmental Influences; *Family Life; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Marriage; *Nonverbal Communication; Social Relations; *Verbal Communication

ABSTRACT

An analysis of the extraverbal communication processes in newlywed couples is described. The aim of the research was to discover whether certain extraverbal communications are related to happiness in a marriage and, eventually, to its duration. Among specific significant findings with regard to behavior ratings were: (1) chair distance was negatively related to other-touching, indicating that the closer the couple sat together, the more likely it was that they also used gestures touching each other and were touching for longer periods of time; (2) eye contact was the variable which correlated best with all the other behavioral ratings; (3) open position of arms was unrelated to open position of legs (open position of arms appeared to be more related to interpersonal closeness than open position of legs); and (4) if a person lists a topic of conflict, he means to say it is also a source of unhappiness to him. The authors conclude that they demonstrated that self ratings of marital happiness show a clear relationship to the use of subtle cues, such as eye contact and touching, which indicated personal closeness. (Author/TA)

ED054497

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Subtle Interactive Cues in Newlyweds

Ernst G. Beier and Daniel P. Sternberg

University of Utah

The present study is concerned with an analysis of extraverbal communication processes in newlywed couples. We wanted to discover whether certain extraverbal communications are related to happiness in a marriage and, eventually, to its duration. We thought that such cues as "touching each other," "eye contact," "open and closed sitting position" of the newlyweds, and "taking initiative" in talking to each other would be related to the quality of the marriage relationship.

The theoretical considerations underlying the study rest on the assumption that an individual helps to determine the responses he obtains from others by coding subtle extraverbal cues into his messages. With such coding he creates an "emotional climate" in the other person which in turn helps to bring about a response set favorable to the response desired (Beier, 1966). By creating the response sets in others, a sender will, to a large extent, create his own world by fashioning the specific response he needs. With his codings, he then determines his environment, often without knowing how much of this world is his own creation. The subtle cues a person codes into his messages, then would give information on the psychological environment a person will encounter. In effect then, one would possibly be able to predict whether such an environment is likely to enhance a given relationship and whether it is defined as lasting or nonpermanent.

The present study is only the first in a number of investigations. Here we are reporting on verbal and extraverbal cues which were obtained

CG 006 630

from newlywed interactions. Additionally, the couples were given questionnaires to measure their conflict areas. The present study is concerned with relating verbal and extraverbal cues to the degree of conflict and stress a couple is reporting.

In the past, research with married couples has concentrated on such areas as spouses' disagreement with each other (Katz, 1965; Tharp, 1963), complaints of couples applying for divorce (Levinger, 1966), common areas of interest, pathological marriages (Tharp, 1963), or such specifics as decision-making processes (Winter & Ferreira, 1969). More recently, there have been studies of adjustment patterns to predict good and poor marriages (e.g., Barry, 1970; Hooper & Sheldon, 1969). Some of these studies on marriage included an occasional index of nonverbal behavior (touching, eye contact, gestures) to evaluate the status of couples.

The present study is not only oriented towards investigating the relationship of stress and interactive cues, but also toward discovering the interrelationship of measures of extraverbal behaviors themselves. The extraverbal behaviors of most interest are those which have been found to be indices of "closeness in interpersonal relationships." Eye contact has consistently been found to have a positive relationship with interpersonal closeness (Duncan, 1969; Navron, 1967). Certain postural cues (open and closed posttions of arms and legs) were related to feelings of closeness to others (Mehrabian, 1969). Other types of nonverbal behavior found to be important were self and other-touching,and spatial distance between two people (Duncan, 1969; Mehrabian, 1969; Winter & Ferreira, 1969). The time spent (by each spouse) talking has also been found to relate to marital adjustment (Mishler & Waxler, 1968; Navron, 1967). For information on a couple's areas of conflict and stress, we used a questionnaire which

contained requests for ratings of such crucial topics as "friends," "children," "sex," "recreation," and the like; but this questionnaire not only required information on areas of disagreement, but also on the degree of unhappiness a spouse would attach to such a rating of disagreement.

An adaptation of the Semantic Differential test (Beier, 1959) was administered and was thought to yield differences among the couples with regard to language usage. The word father, mother, son, and daughter were rated. It was hypothesized that couples who demonstrate the least amount of stress (as measured by the conflict questionnaire) would also rank high in the assumed extraverbal "closeness" indicators (such as longest eye contact, other-touching, etc.) Eventually we want to use this information to investigate whether this information would be predictive of the permanence of the marriage.

Method

Subjects

Fifty-one couples married from three to six months were seen in this study. Both husbands and wives were under 24 years of age, and had no record of any previous marriage. These couples, whose names had been obtained from the Salt Lake City Marriage License Bureau, responded to a letter sent to a total of 350 recently married couples. Most religions were represented in this sample, though 75% of the couples belonged to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Education and occupation, as well as socioeconomic status, were heterogeneous for the sample. Yet, a "volunteer" bias cannot be ruled out.

Procedure and Apparatus

After responding to an inital letter, each couple was given an appointment to be seen for an interview at the University of Utah. The letter indicated that patterns of communication in newlyweds were being studied, and that there would be some remuneration for couples who desired to participate in the study.

Each couple was videotaped for approximately 30 minutes in a studio provided by the Instructional Television Department of the University of Utah. In addition to the experimenter, a professional studio technician was also in the room with the couple being interviewed. The technician was responsible for operating the video equipment, but otherwise did not interact with the couple.

An identical procedure was used with each couple interviewed. Upon entering the studio room, the couple was instructed to "grab" the two chairs (which had been intentionally placed at the distance of 10 feet from each other) and bring these chairs into the suitable part of the room for videotaping. The spatial distance between the chairs was then unobtrusively measured and used as data in this study.

Recorded instruction were given throughout the interview to ensure an identical and consistent procedure for each couple involved. After the couple was seated and chair distance were measured, the instructions began with questions relating to background information (religion of each spouse, length of engagement, parents' marital adjustment and such broad questions as to "what divorce meant to them").

Following these questions, the Topics Scale (see Appendix A) was filled out independently by husband and wife. This scale was based on topics often described as the major problem in marriages (Blanck, 1961; Hooper & Sheldon, 1969; Lantz & Snyder, 1962; Levinger, 1966). As stated, the Scale was used for obtaining information in marital disagreements and the degree of unhappiness attached to such disagreements. After the scale was completed, the couple was told to select one of the topics of the scale and discuss it for several minutes. The experimenter did not participate in the discussion, but was primarily responsible for controlling the recorded instructions and for delivery and collection of the test materials. He also answered questions needing clarification.

After discussing the selected topic (3-5 minutes for most couples). the next task required of the couple was to discuss what it meant "to be or feei needed." Previous research has found this to be a relevant topic that may be related to adjustment in marriage (e.g., Navron, 1967). Most couples used three minutes or less to discuss this topic.

Next, three TAT cards were simultaneously presented to the couple. The cards were placed upon a low table located in front of the couple. Card 4 was placed in the left most position, card 10 was in the middle, and 3 BM was in the right most position. This procedure was in accord with one used by Winter and Ferreira (1969) who were measuring hostility themes in families. Their procedure was employed in t is study, however, to measure cooperation and communication patterns. The instructions requested that both husband and wife were to make up a story which would link the three TAT cards ogether. They were advised to constrict the story in the manner that husband and wife would alternate in telling the story with a sentence at a time.

At the completion of the story, a random version of the Semantic Differential Scale developed by Beier (1959) was given to husband and wife to fill out independently. This 10 scale instrument rated the words "mother," "father," "son," and "daughter." The interview was concluded after the couple finished this scale.

All videotaped interviews were then rated by undergraduates for non-verbal behaviors, such as self-touching, other-touching, open and closed position of arms, open and closed position of legs, laughing, talking, and eye contact. Each rater rated only one of these behaviors with at least 10 couples. Inter-rater reliability of these behaviors (e.g., eye contact) was generally found to be reasonably high (.80).

Results

All the data from Topics Scale (topics contributing to conflict and unhappiness) and the Semantic Differential test (self-ratings), and the behavioral ratings (nonverbal) were factor analyzed. The factors and the correlation matrix are presented below.

A factor analysis with rotations resulted in 14 factors, which are summarized in Table 1.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 1 About Here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Each factor is loaded with either the behavioral ratings (e.g., Factor 4) or self-ratings (e.g., Factor 10). In no instance do both the behavioral and self-ratings contribute to any one factor. It appears that the measures (i.e., Topics Scale, Semantic Differential, and behavioral ratings) are independent of each other and do not measure overlapping attributes.

Correlational Analysis of All Factors

Results of the correlational analysis[1] also supported the finding that the behavioral ratings and self-ratings were unrelated. Specific significant findings with regard to the behavioral ratings were: chair distance was negatively related to other-touching ($df = 85$, $r = -.43$, $p < .01$) indicating that the closer the couple sat together, the more likely it was that they also used gestures touching each other, and were touching for longer periods of time; other than this, chair distance was unrelated to any other variable. Eye contact was the variable which correlated best with all the other behavioral ratings, which was expected from previous research where eye contact was found to be a reliable indicant of closeness (Duncan, 1969; Mehrabian, 1969). Open position of arms was unrelated to open position of

---

[1]Matrix available on request.

legs. Open position of arms was found to be related to some of the other behavioral ratings (eye contact, other-touching, talking and laughing), whereas open position of legs was not (except for eye contact and laughing). Open position of arms appears to be more related to interpersonal closeness than open position of legs.

For the Topics Scale, the correlational analysis indicated that conflict ratings were related to unhappiness ratings. This relationship was highly significant for each topic. That is to say, if a person lists a topic of conflict he means to say that it is also a source of unhappiness to him. "Money" was the topic found to correlate most highly with the other topics on the Scale, both with conflict and unhappiness ratings. Dimensions of the Semantic Differential Scale were unrelated to any of the other variables.

Husbands and Wives

All variables were examined for differences in ratings between all husbands and all wives. Means of all variables were compared for significant differences with two-tailed t tests. Results are summarized in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 2, 3, and 4 here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

As can be noted, husbands and wives differed significantly with regard to "spare time together" and "money" on the Topics Scale. These two topics appeared to have a very different value to husbands than to wives. Husbands sat with their arms and legs open longer than wives did and tended to talk more as well.[2] Wives laughed more than husbands. Husbands and wives did not differ on touching, although wives tended to demonstrate more self-touching than husbands.

As can be seen from the Table 2 (Semantic Differential) the husbands did not differ in the use of the 4 key words with the exception of the

---

[2]All means for behavioral ratings are based on transformed data (cube root transformation). Original data was markedly skewed to the right.

son-daughter dimension ($p<.10$) which has given us some interesting hunches.

The data were also examined to evaluate couples who more often agreed and disagreed with each other. This made it necessary to divide the total sample into two groups. These two groups were called Low Disagreement (LD) and High Disagreement (HD) groups. LD groups consisted of couples who had differences in total scores of less than 5 points, whereas the HD groups consisted of couples with scores separated by 14 points or more (on the Topics Scale). Means were computed separately for husbands and wives for each variable. (Results appear in Tables 5, 6, and 7.)

- -
Insert Tables 5, 6, and 7 About Here
- -

Low Disagreement and High Disagreement groups on extraverbal behavior.

Results indicate that couples in the LD groups sit closer together than couples in the HD group. They appear to look at each other for a longer time, touch each other more often and self-touch less often than the HD group. They also hold their legs in a more open position. The LD's rate money, religion, and friends as the most severe topics of conflict while the HD (that is the High Disagreement couples) are upset (and by far more upset than the LD group) about sex, friends, money, and their unborn children's education.

Low Disagreement and High Disagreement groups on topic scales.

Husbands and wives in both LD and HD groups were then compared separately on topics, ratings, and behaviors to note any differences between them. Results appear in Tables 8 & 9.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Tables 8 & 9 About Here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Husbands in the LD group differed from their wives on the importance of spare time. It appeared that wives of this group touched

themselves and their husbands more often than vice versa. Husbands talked a little longer and were significantly freer in their open arms and legs positions than their wives. On the other hand in the HD group, the husbands differed by being very unhappy about their wives' lack of love and concern for them, about their spare time, and about money matters, all of these characteristics being of more concern to them than to their wives. The HD husbands and wives, however, did not differ from each other on self-touching or other-touching. HD husbands had significantly more open arms and legs than wives. HD couples tended to touch themselves more and each other less than the LD husbands and wives.

Unhappiness scales (four subgroups) and extraverbal behavior.

Finally, an attempt was made to divide the couples into four subgroups on the total amount of complaining they were doing (Topics Scales). These four groups were essentially (1) husbands with scores one standard deviation above the mean (that is, husbands were high complainers who had wives with scores at or below the mean, or wives who were low complainers) (2) wives with scores one standard deviation above the mean, that is high complainers with husbands having scores at or below the mean, that is, low complainers (3) husbands and wives who had scores one standard deviation above the mean and (4) husbands and wives who had scores one standard deviation below the mean. Means of the observed behaviors were then computed for each group by combining the selected husbands and wives scores.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 10 About Here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Inspecting Table 10 we note that couples consisting of low complaining husbands and high complaining wives tended to display least "other-touching" and "open arm" positions. They also talked the least though

they seemed to smile a lot. Couples consisting of husbands and wives who are both complainers tend to sit furthest apart, have least eye contact, and talk a lot, and indulge themselves more in self-touching than others. But where husband and wife are both low on complaints, they have five "first" rankings in closeness such as "other-touching" most "open arm" and "leg" positions though they also have the least "smiling," embarrassed or otherwise. The couples who complain least on the scales, seem happier and closer to each other; in fact they show a majority of "firsts" in our indicators of (Group 4) human closeness as predicted. If such data should stand up we may have found in our measurement of subtle behavior cues a means of assessing the emotional climate of familial interactions.

Discussion

Our main questions were concerned with a greater understanding of the interaction processes of newlyweds and with an analysis of the subtle cues of these interactions and their relation to stress in marriage. We demonstrated that self ratings of marital happiness show a clear relationship to the use of subtle cues such as eye contact and touching which indicated to us personal closeness.

In addition, we analyzed the topic scale for a rank order of conflicts separately for husbands and wives and also looked at the way they ranked from the most to the least important the labels they had assigned marital unhappiness.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table II About Here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Husbands list politics as a conflict area but they are most unhappy about money and friends. Wives on the other hand consider friends as the number one source of conflict and unhappiness. Wives also list

religion as the second highest source of unhappiness and by and large seem to be more concerned with "ambitions" than husbands are. Apparently newlyweds do not report significant sex problems and it will be interesting to discover whether this topic gains greater significance in follow-up studies. Altogether, husbands give higher conflict and unhappiness ratings than their wives, which may tell us something about how marriages are made.

The Semantic Differential Scale showed us that the husband used the words "mother and "daughter" almost alike while at the same time they used the word "son" and "daughter" as very distinct entities. Husbands place the largest distance between the words "father" and "daughter" and so do wives; is this a linguistic confirmation of the incest taboo? The distance between "mother" and "son" is the second largest for both husbands and wives. Some deept theoretitians may argue that newlyweds get married because they are able to place large semantic distances between themselves and their parents. It would be interesting to know if unmarried young couples, homosexuals or singles would indeed show smaller semantic distances between these words.

This study of newlywed couples' interactions demonstrated that the subtle cues we rated allowed us to advance a reasonable hypothesis that such cues may be prognostic of happy and perhaps lasting marriages. We were particularly impressed by such measures as eye contact, touching, open and closed positions, and found them to give useful information. The data from this study suggest that subtle cues in the interaction of newlyweds are measureable and appear to distinguish stress states. It might be quite possible that they also help us to make a reasonable prediction as to which of the marriages is likely to fail. After all, the micro-analysis of behavior should contain the pertinent information of consequent behaviors.

Table 1

Factor Analysis of All Variables

Variables	Factors with Significant Loadings						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Semantic Differential							
Son-Daughter			.83				
Son-Mother			.87				
Son-Father							
Father-Daughter			.88				
Father-Mother			.84				
Daughter-Mother							
Topics Scale							
Money-Conflict (C)							
Money-Unhappiness (U)							
Children-C							
Children-U							
Sex-C							
Sex-U							
Concern & Love-C							
Concern & Love-U							
Spare Time Together-C							
Spare Time Together-U						.89	
Friends-C						.84	
Friends-U							
Ambition-C							
Ambition-U							
Politics-C							
Politics-U							
Childrens' Education-C	-.82						
Childrens' Education-U	-.76						
Religion-C	-.42						
Religion-U	-.66						
Behavioral Ratings							
Chair Distance (Inches)							
Eye Contact							
Total Time-seconds		.49	-.50				
Instances of behavior		.45	-.53				
Self-Touching							.93
Total Time-seconds							.94
Instances of behavior							
Other-Touching					-.92		
Total Time-seconds					-.93		
Instances of behavior							
Open Position--Arms							
Total Time-seconds		.58					
Instances of behavior		.51					
Open Position--Legs				-.93			
Total Time-seconds				-.90			
Instances of behavior							
Talking				-.51			
Total Time-seconds							
Instances of behavior							
Laughing							
Total Time-seconds		.89					
Instances of behavior		.92					

Table 1
(Continued)
Factor Analysis of All Variables

Variables	Factors with Significant Loadings						
	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Semantic Differential							
Son-Daughter							
Son-Mother					-.57		
Son-Father							
Father-Daughter							
Father-Mother					-.74		
Daughter-Mother							
Topics Scale							
Money-Conflict (C)						.56	
Money-Unhappiness (U)						.49	
Children-C				-.86			
Children-U				-.78			
Sex-C		-.86					
Sex-U		-.77					
Concern & Love-C			.23				-.72
Concern & Love-U			.47				-.31
Spare Time Together-C			.76				
Spare Time Together-U			.84				
Friends-C							
Friends-U						.88	
Ambition-C						.80	
Ambition-U							
Politics-C	-.80						
Politics-U	-.69						
Childrens' Education-C							
Childrens' Education-U							-.46
Religion-C							-.37
Religion-U							
Behavioral Ratings							
Chair Distance (Inches)							
Eye Contact							
Total Time-seconds							
Instances of behavior							
Self-Touching							
Total Time-seconds							
Instances of behavior							
Other-Touching							
Total Time-seconds							
Instances of behavior							
Open Position--Arms							
Total Time-seconds							
Instances of behavior							
Open Position--Legs							
Total Time-seconds							
Instances of behavior							
Talking							
Total Time-seconds							
Instances of behavior							
Laughing							
Total Time-seconds							
Instances of behavior							

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Husbands' and Wives' Sum of Differences Scores on the Semantic Differential

Variable	Husbands' Sum of Difference Scores (N=51)		Wives' Sum of Difference Scores (N=51)		p (two-tailed t)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Son-Daughter	12.00	5.70	10.04	5.38	.10
Son-Mother	12.67	5.11	11.37	5.29	
Son-Father	8.96	4.35	9.45	4.71	
Father-Daughter	13.43	6.04	11.75	5.28	
Father-Mother	13.12	5.56	11.51	5.14	
Daughter-Mother	5.90	3.05	7.02	3.99	

Table 3

Husbands' and Wives' Topics Listed for Conflicts

Topics	Husbands (N=50) Mean	SD	Wives (N=50) Mean	SD	p (two-tailed t)
Money	2.34	1.24	2.16	1.45	
Children	2.06	1.53	1.63	1.22	
Sex	1.98	1.33	1.69	.97	
Concern and Love	1.73	1.22	1.47	.73	
Spare Time Together	2.08	1.32	1.53	.81	.02
Friends	2.26	1.26	2.49	1.54	
Ambition	1.65	1.15	1.75	1.16	
Politics	2.90	1.94	2.42	1.61	
Childrens' Education	1.56	1.03	1.30	.71	
Religion	2.50	1.94	1.98	1.66	
Total Conflict Score	20.55	6.94	18.06	5.62	.10

Table 3a

Husbands' and Wives' Topics Rated for Unhappiness

Topics	Husbands (N=50) Mean	SD	Wives (N=50) Mean	SD	p (two-tailed t)
Money	2.46	1.5[illegible]	1.88	1.36	.05
Children	1.75	1.[illegible]1	1.55	1.03	
Sex	2.00	1.51	1.71	1.15	
Concern and Love	1.90	1.43	1.51	1.19	
Spare Time Together	2.14	1.34	1.41	.73	.002
Friends	2.28	1.50	2.33	1.40	
Ambition	1.86	1.41	1.70	1.22	
Politics	2.20	1.55	2.02	1.41	
Childrens' Education	1.48	.93	1.30	.74	
Religion	2.09	1.80	1.93	1.59	
Total Unhappiness Score	19.71	8.78	16.90	6.88	.10
Total Score for Whole Scale	40.26	14.49	34.96	13.18	.10

Table 4

Husbands' and Wives' Extraverbal Behavior Ratings

Behaviors	Husbands (N=40)		Wives (N=40)		
	X	S.D.	X	S. D.	p (two-tailed test)
Eye Contact	3.37	.99	3.32	.94	
	2.52	.48	2.50	.47	
Self-touching	4.38	2.50	5.48	1.74*	.05
	2.16	.93	2.44	.57	
Other-touching	1.95	2.64	2.42	2.78	
	.92	1.07	1.11	1.09	
Open Position--Arms	6.07	1.96	5.21	1.90*	.10
	2.47	.69	2.41	.66	
Open Position--Legs	6.74	2.37	3.01	3.30*	.001
	2.64	.87	1.22	1.24*	.001
Talking	5.54	1.21	5.16	.99	
	3.22	.59	2.98	.64*	.10
Laughing	1.81	1.07	2.65	.98*	.001
	1.59	.83	2.21	.75*	.001

*Indicates "instances" of behavior.

Table 5

Topics Rated for Conflict by Couples in the

High and Low Disagreement Groups

Topics	Low Disagreement (N=38)	High Disagreement (N=30)	
	Mean	Mean	p
Money	2.05	1.42	.10
Children	1.50	1.61	
Sex	1.41	3.57	.002
Concern and Love	1.21	1.36	
Spare Time Together	1.63	2.52	.02
Friends	2.00	3.26	.002
Ambition	1.45	1.04	
Politics	1.92	2.56	
Childrens' Education	1.17	2.96	.002
Religion	2.17	2.35	

Table 6

Topics Rated for Unhappiness by Couples in the High and Low Disagreement Groups

Topics	Low Disagreement (N=38) Mean	High Disagreement (N=30) Mean	p
Money	1.70	3.04	.01
Children	1.32	2.93	.002
Sex	1.30	1.52	
Concern and Love	1.50	1.53	
Spare Time Together	1.66	1.97	
Friends	1.89	1.90	
Ambition	1.42	1.27	
Politics	1.54	2.00	
Childrens' Education	1.19	1.11	
Religion	1.97	2.00	

Table 7

Extraverbal Behavior Ratings of High and Low Disagreement Groups

Behaviors	Low Disagreement (N=38)		High Disagreement (N=30)		
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	p
Eye Contact	3.30	.77	3.03	.88	
	2.43	.39	2.39	.58	
Self-touching	4.90	2.55	5.08	2.14	
	2.21	.98	2.44	.68	
Other-touching	2.10	2.52	1.11	1.79	.10
	1.04	1.01	.64	.88	
Open Position--Arms	5.22	2.30	5.77	1.56	
	2.32	.84	2.50	.53	
Open Position--Legs	5.00	3.37	4.81	3.06	
	1.99	1.24	1.94	1.10	
Talking	5.37	.93	5.12	1.38	
	3.04	.61	2.99	.50	
Laughing	2.01	1.29	2.19	.80	
	1.70	.96	1.84	.51	
Chair Distances	1.49	.94	1.92	.87	.10

*Indicates instances of behavior.

Table 8

Differences Between Husbands and Wives in the Low Disagreement Group

Variable	Husbands (N=19) Mean	SD	Wives (N=19) Mean	SD	p
Spare Time Together	1.89	.99	1.37	.60	
Conflict	1.84	1.01	1.47	.84	
Unhappiness	4.17	5.05	5.59	1.79	
Self-Touching	(1.98)*	(1.27)*	(2.43)	(.56)	
Other-Touching	1.79	2.59	2.41	2.49	
	(.88)	(1.05)	(1.20)	(.97)	
Talking	5.62	.67	5.13	1.09	
	(3.13)	(.42)	(2.94)	(.76)	
Open Position--Arms	5.61	2.66	4.82	1.85	.10
	(2.29)	(.99)	(2.35)	(.68)	
Open Position--Legs	6.31	2.63	3.43	3.57	.02
	(2.49)	(.95)	(1.38)	(1.32)	.01

* Indicates instances of behavior.

Table 9

Differences Between Husbands and Wives in the High Disagreement Group

Variable	Husbands (N=15) Mean	SD	Wives (N=15) Mean	SD	p
Concern and Love					
Conflict	2.53	1.55	1.64	.93	.10
Unhappiness	2.80	2.01	1.36	.84	.02
Spare Time Together					
Conflict	2.47	1.55	1.64	.74	.10
Unhappiness	2.67	1.63	1.45	1.31	.02
Money					
Conflict	2.67	1.29	2.46	1.94	
Unhappiness	3.20	1.66	2.08	1.75	.10
Eye Contact	3.03	.87	3.03	.87	
	(2.40)*	(.53)*	(2.39)	(.53)	
Self-Touching	5.16	2.38	5.03	2.02	
	(2.45)	(.71)	(2.43)	(.69)	
Other-Touching	1.07	1.60	1.15	2.02	
	(.67)	(.86)	(.62)	(.94)	
Talking	5.15	1.70	5.08	1.01	
	(3.03)	(.45)	(2.96)	(.57)	
Open Position--Arms	6.41	1.10	5.18	1.72	.05
	(2.56)	(.56)	(2.45)	(.66)	
Open Position--Legs	6.93	1.64	2.85	2.77	.001
	(2.72)	(.43)	(1.23)	(1.05)	.001

* Indicates instances of behavior.

Table 10

Extraverbal Behavior Ratings for Disagreement Subgroups

Variable	Group 1 Husband-High Wife-Low Mean	Group 2 Husband-Low Wife-High Mean	Group 3 Husband-High Wife-High Mean	Group 4 Husband-Low Wife-Low Mean
Chair Distances	2.01	1.95	2.05	1.89**
Eye Contact	3.12 (2.44)*	2.95 (2.09)	2.30 (2.00)	3.34** (2.44)
Self-Touching	3.63 (1.73)	3.76 (1.79)	3.94 (1.85)	2.40** (.97)
Other-Touching	1.47 (.73)	.18 (.18)	1.76 (.75)	2.30** (.95)
Open Position--Arms	4.48 (1.94)	3.18 (1.41)	3.78 (1.63)	6.22** (2.60)
Open Position--Legs	4.20 (1.74)	4.68 (1.89)	2.80 (1.13)	6.39** (2.44)
Talking	4.66 (2.80)	3.36 (1.74)	3.89 (2.36)	5.00** (2.48)
Laughing	2.01** (1.72)	1.95 (1.62)	1.61 (1.42)	1.22 (1.10)

* Indicates instances of behavior.

** Indicates most interpersonal closeness based on our estimates.

Table 11

Rank Order of Topic
Listed as Conflicts
or Sources of
Unhappiness

	Conflict		Unhappiness	
	Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife
Most	Politics	Friends	Money	Friends
	Religion	Politics	Friends	Religion
	Money	Money	Politics	Politics
	Friends	Religion	Spare time	Money
	Spare time	Sex	Religion	Sex
	Children	Children	Sex	Ambition
	Sex	Ambition	Concern	Children
Least	Concern	Spare time	Ambition	Concern
	Ambition	Concern	Children	Spare time
	Child education	Child education	Child education	Child education

CONFIDENTIAL

Name: _____

Date: _____

Department of Psychology
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Beier-Sternberg Project, 1970

IMPORTANT TOPICS IN MARRIAGE

With these scales, we want to find out what you believe are the areas of agreement or disagreement in your marriage. We also want to find out if these areas of agreement and disagreement make you feel happy, sad or indifferent. For example, if money is a topic of much disagreement in your marriage, you could make a mark in Scale 1: Degree of Agreement under the numbers 5, 6 or 7 depending on the extent of your disagreement. If you were to make a mark under the number 7, this would mean that you feel there is much disagreement about money in your marriage. If you were to mark under the number 5, this means you feel there is some disagreement about money.

With Scale 1 we want to find out how you differ from your spouse in looking at things. In Scale 2 we want to find out how you feel about these differences. If, for example, a disagreement were to make you very unhappy, as in the "Money" example given above, you would mark 6 or 7 on Scale 2: Results of Agreement or Disagreement. Please check each item in both scales. Remember, the higher the number the more disagreement or conflict over a particular topic; the lower the number, the more agreement.

	Scale 1: Degree of Agreement							Scale 2: Results of Agreement or Disagreement						
	Agree						Disagree	Happy						Unhappy
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Money														
Children														
Sex														
Concern & Love														
Doing things together (in spare time)														
Friends and Social life														
Getting ahead, Ambition														
Politics														
Children's education														
Religion														
Other(s); please specify.														